

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed on 10/25/06 in which claims 1-37 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said selected at least one service uses" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this imitation in the claim.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 1 is amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the imitation. This overcomes the rejection of claim 1 under - 35 USC § 112.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said at least one service agent" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said software" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said software" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said software" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said software" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this imitation in the claim.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 3 is amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations. This overcomes the rejection of claim 3 under - 35 USC § 112.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 27-37 are rejected under 35 USC. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,092,699 to Hefter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,619 to Sawada.

In response, the applicant respectfully states that Claims 1-2, 27-37 are apparently not made unpatentable by the invention of Hefter and Sawada. The present invention, claimed in Claims 1-2, 27-37"

"Provides methods and apparatus for accessing and controlling services, such as home automation services, visually employing established wireless, cellular telecommunication technologies for voice communications. In example embodiments, users of personal portable devices connect to services over dial-up, wireless, cellular, circuit-switched voice telephone networks, receive and display listings of available services and use these listings to access and manipulate the services."

The referenced cited art to Hefter, US Patent 7,092,699, filed: April 11, 2001, is entitled:

"Seamless wireless phone access service." The Hefter abstract reads:

"A method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for synchronizing the memory of a wireless telephone with a networked computer over a wireless link. A communication network in accordance with the present invention, includes a plurality of portable wireless telephones; a plurality of base stations; and at least one controller coupled to the Internet. The portable wireless telephone is adapted to operate a program that stores information locally and automatically synchronizes the local memory with a host computer on the Internet. In operation, when a wireless telephone user receives a telephone call or data from the Internet, the number or the information is stored in the telephone memory and then automatically stored on a computer coupled to the Internet. In another embodiment, a computer coupled to the Internet is adapted to automatically synchronize a portion of

the information stored in its memory with that of a portable wireless telephone. The Internet computer may in effect be used to reconstitute the wireless telephone memory”.

The other referenced art cited to Sawada , US Patent 6,735,619, filed: February 3, 2000, is entitled: “Home network gateway apparatus and home network device”. The Sawada abstract reads:

“A home network gateway apparatus controls information of home network devices connected to an IEEE 1394 bus in a unified manner in a household. When a device is connected to the home network, the home network gateway apparatus of the present invention acquires information of each device and posts the information on a built-in WWW server in a list menu format. The user can remotely control home network devices individually from an apparatus on another network via the list menu”.

Thus, Hefter is concerned with synchronizing the memory of a wireless telephone with a networked computer over a wireless link. Sawada is concerned with providing a home network gateway apparatus controls information of home network devices connected to an IEEE 1394 bus in a unified manner in a household. The combined references are not concerned with the enabling of remote control of services at a residential network without the necessity of a service provider as in claims 1-37.

Furthermore, there is apparently no reason to make the combination of Hefter and Sawada except in an effort to apparently use hindsight in an attempt to find and/or make all the elements of Claims 1-2, 27-37 obvious. In order to make a combination, at least one of the references in the combination must cite the other. One skilled in the art would not combine an invention of Hefter in primary US Class **455/414.1** with the invention of Sawada in primary US Class **709/212**. Besides even when combined the combination does not teach, allude to or make obvious the presently claimed invention in Claims 1-2, 27-37. Thus Claims 1-2, 27-37 are allowable over the combined art.

1. As per claims 1, 27- 30, Hefter teaches a service interaction method for a user to interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a home data distribution

network, said home data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used access said at least one remote service from a serving entity, the step of interacting comprising: employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN, said user connecting a serving entity attached to said home data distribution network using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network (See col. 4, lines 43-54, col. 9, lines 34-54). However, Hefter fails to teach obtaining and viewing a least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols; selecting said at least one remote service from said list; selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said selected at least one service uses; and accessing and viewing said least one remote service in obtaining desired results.

Sawada teaches a home network gateway apparatus and a home network device.

Furthermore, Sawada teaches obtaining and viewing a least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols (See col. 1, lines 39-43, col. 2, lines 16-50); selecting said at least one remote service from said list (See col. selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said selected at least one service uses; and accessing and viewing said least one remote service in obtaining desired results (See col. 4, lines 45-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make remotely control home devices available using wide-area network such as the internet (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the reading of the elements of claim 1 and Hefter and/or Sawada. Claim 1 as amended reads:

1. A service interaction method comprising a user interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a home data distribution network, said home data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used to access said at least one remote service from a serving entity, the step of interacting comprising:

employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN, said user connecting to a serving entity attached to said home data distribution network using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network,

obtaining and viewing a list of at least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using at least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols;

selecting said at least one remote service from said list;

selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said at least one remote service uses; and

accessing and viewing said at least one remote service in obtaining desired results.

Firstly, a review of Hefter, shows that Hefter fails to teach "a service interaction method for a user to interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a home data distribution network, said home data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used access said at least one remote service from a serving entity," as the office communication states above. Hefter [col. 2, lines 4-11] teaches synchronization, in particular for "providing automatic synchronization of a wireless device with a host computer over a wireless network. More specifically, in one embodiment, a system and method consistent with the present invention synchronizes a wireless device having personal organizer and directory functionality with a host computer having the same or similar functionality over a wireless network."

The office communication cited portion of Hefter, (See col. 4, lines 43-54, col. 9, lines 34-54), shows that Hefter fails to teach or make obvious even the first elements of claim 1.. Hefter col. 4, lines 43-54, reads:

"Referring to FIG. 1, an exemplary communication network system 10 in which the present invention may be implemented is disclosed. System 10 is comprised of a plurality of wireless telephones 100, a wireless sub-network 102, a network interface 101, and a computer network 104. Wireless sub-network 102 is further comprised of a plurality of base stations 116 and a controller 112. Computer network 104 is further comprised of a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) 110, a plurality of telephones represented by

telephone 111, and a plurality of computers represented by computer 117. While not shown, it is understood that computer 117 could also represent the Internet). Network system 10 may have other components/configurations, but these are not shown to facilitate description of the unique aspects of this embodiment of the invention."

Hefter col. 9, lines 34-54 read:

"FIG. 10 shows a detailed flow diagram of the process performed when a user of a wireless telephone 100 dials a number for a computer 117 on network 104. As shown in step 1010, when a user initiates an access request (dials the number to a network interface corresponding to computer 117, or speaks command into user interface 214), the request is transmitted to public switch 140. In step 1020, public switch 140 issues a request to CTI server 144 requesting that the CTI server 144 provide the public switch with instructions as to what to do with the dialing request. CTI server 144 determines whether there are any available ports on the multiplexer/demultiplexer 142 (step 1030). (Note, there can be a dialog between the CTI server 144 and the multiplexer/demultiplexer 142 to determine the appropriate terminating port and associated telephone number). If there are available ports (step 1040), CTI server 144 instructs the switch 140 to redirect the call to a telephone number representing a free port on multiplexer/demultiplexer 142. The multiplexer/demultiplexer 142 will then establish the path to computer 117 and information will flow freely between wireless telephone 100 and the computer 117."

Although, these portions use words and some phrases as in claim 1, the words are not combined to make the of the steps of interacting or the step employing of claim 1. Hefter does not make obvious "a user interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a home data distribution network, said home data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used to access said at least one remote service from a serving entity." Hefter is not concerned with interacting with a remote service. Hefter is not concerned with a remote service accessible through a home data distribution network being an aggregation of a communications media and a communications protocol used to access the remote service from a serving entity. Hefter is not concerned with employing **only one of** a cellular voice network and a PSTN. Hefter is not concerned with a user connecting to a serving entity attached to a home data distribution network using a client device as in claim 1.

Similarly, exception is taken with the office communication statement regarding the teaching of claim 1 elements by Sawada (See col. 1, lines 39-43, col. 2, lines 16-50). Sawada col. 1, lines 39-43, reads:

"Then, when accessed by a device incorporating a WWW browser on another network, the home network gateway apparatus sends necessary information to the device and displays a list of home network devices on the display of the device."

Sawada col. 2, lines 16-50, reads:

"In another mode of the home network gateway apparatus of the present invention, when instructed by an apparatus incorporating a WWW browser on the home network or a network other than the home network to remotely control the home network device via the list menu, the home network gateway apparatus sends control information to the home network device based on the device operation information and makes the device execute the operation as instructed.

This makes it possible to remotely control the home network device via the homepage.

In another mode of the home network gateway apparatus of the present invention, if a device is connected to the home network, the home network gateway apparatus acquires identification information and download server address information output from the home network apparatus. The home network gateway apparatus then accesses the download server based on the address information and downloads and stores the screen creation information and device operation information on the home network device. The home network gateway apparatus then posts information of all devices connected to the home network in a list menu form on a built-in WWW server.

In another mode of the home network gateway apparatus, if connection of a home network device to the home network is canceled, the home network gateway apparatus automatically deletes the information of the device from the list menu.

In another mode of the home network gateway apparatus, when instructed by an apparatus incorporating a WWW browser on the home network or a network other than the home network to remotely control the home network device via the list menu, the home network gateway apparatus sends control information to the home network device based on the device operation information and makes the device execute the operation as instructed.

A review of these portions of Sawada shows that Sawada does not teach, allude to or make obvious the other steps of claim 1 for obtaining, selecting or accessing of claim 1. Sawada does not teach, allude to or make obvious a step of obtaining and viewing a list of at least one remote service. Sawada's list is "a list of home network devices on the display of the device." Sawada does not teach, allude to or make obvious "accessible remote services from a serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using at least one of said

communications media and one of said communications protocols." Sawada does not teach, allude to cannot make obvious selecting a remote service from a list Sawada doesn't have. Sawada does not teach, allude to or make obvious selecting a communications media and a communications protocol that a remote service uses. Finally Sawada does not teach, allude to or make obvious a step of "accessing and viewing said at least one remote service in obtaining desired results." Thus claim 1 and all claims that depend on claim 1 are allowable over the cited combined art.

2. As per claim 2 Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein the client device is portable (col. 4, lines 43-45).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that it was shown that Hefter fails to teach the claimed invention, and claim 2 is allowable because it depends on claim 1.

3. As per claim 31, Hefter teaches a broadband network with enterprise wireless communication systems for residential and business environment. Furthermore, Hefter teaches an apparatus attaches on a home network for a user using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched voice telephony network, to interact with at least one service on said home network, said apparatus comprising: a telephone modem to directly receive an incoming call from a client device (See col. 7, lines 1-20) and also to receive and transmit data over a telephone network, said telephone modem having a client port through which the apparatus attaches to the telephone network (See col. 9, lines 33-57), said apparatus being a single apparatus through which a user with the user client device can establish communication in one step, said client device employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN (See col. 4, lines 45-53); a dial-in service module to implement dial-in logic for the client device; and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back and forth between a browser application in the client device and a browser server module (See page 2, paragraph [0014]). However, Hefter fails to teach a browser server module for managing data for remote display and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back. Sawada teaches managing data for remote display and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 31 and Hefter with Sawada. Claim 31 is an apparatus claim and as with claim 1, neither Hefter and/or Sawada have the elements of claim 31. Claim 31 reads

31. An apparatus attached on a home network for a user using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network, to interact with at least one service on said home network, said apparatus comprising:

a telephone modem to directly receive an incoming call from the client device, and also to receive and transmit data over a telephone network, said telephone modem having a client port through which the apparatus attaches to the telephone network, said apparatus being a single apparatus through which a user with the ~~user~~ client device can establish communication in one step,

said client device employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN;

a dial-in service module to implement dial-in logic for the client device;

a browser server module for managing data for remote display; and

a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back and forth between a browser application in the client device and said browser server module.

A review of the cited references shows that the combination apparently do not teach, allude to or make obvious a "client device employing **only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN.**

The combination apparently do not teach, allude to or make obvious "a dial-in service module to implement dial-in logic for the client device. The combination apparently do not teach, allude to or make obvious "a browser server module for managing data for remote display." The combination apparently do not teach, allude to or make obvious "a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back and forth between a browser application in the

client device and said browser server module." Neither cited reference is concerned with protocol transport, implementing dial-in logic, managing data for remote display, or a protocol transport module. Thus claim 31 and all claims that depend thereon are allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 32, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as describe above. However, Hefter teaches wherein said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module (See col. 5, lines 5-10).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that it was shown that Hefter and Sawada fail to teach the invention in claim 31. Hefter col. 5, lines 5-10 reads:

"controller 112, which in turn, controls the base stations 116. Controller 112 communicates with computer network 104 via interface 101 with PSTN 110. To achieve the desired handover functionality required in wireless networks and contemplated by this invention, base stations 116, each communicate with a corresponding controller 112. The various components of network 10 will now be described in more detail. As disclosed in further detail below, network 104 connects telephone and computers to controller 112."

This is not an indication of a teaching "teaches wherein said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module," as stated in the office communication above. So claim 32 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

5. As per claim 33, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device. (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 33 and Hefter with Sawada. A review of the cited portion apparently fails to make the showing stated by the office communication. So claim 33 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

6. As per claim 34, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 34 and Hefter with Sawada. A review of the cited portion apparently fails to make the showing stated by the office communication. So claim 34 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

7. As per claim 35, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However. Hefter fails to teach wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through the client port.

Sawada teaches wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through the client port (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 35 and Hefter with Sawada and the it "would have been obvious" statement above. A review of the cited portion apparently fails to make the showing stated by the office communication. So claim 35 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

8. As per claim 36, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module triggers at least

one particular module in the apparatus to process any incoming calls and requests from a client device (See col. 9, lines 33-55).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 36 and Hefter with Sawada. A review of the cited portion apparently fails to make the showing stated by the office communication. So claim 36 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

9. As per claim 37, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above, Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module performs user authentication (See col. 9, lines 11-25).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the claimed reading of the elements of claim 36 and Hefter with Sawada. A review of the cited portion apparently fails to make the showing stated by the office communication. So claim 36 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 31.

5. Claims 3-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 7,092699 to Hefter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735719 to Sawada as applied to claims 1 above, and in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,988070 to Kawasaki et al.

It is noted that third citation, the cited art to Kawasaki, US Patent 6,988070, filed: May 11, 2001, is entitled: "Voice control system for operating home electrical appliances". The Kawasaki abstract reads:

"A voice control system for managing home electrical appliances includes a home agent server (HAS) connected to the home electrical appliances, a microphone and a speaker linked to the agent server through an in-house network. An transaction processing (TP) program runs on HAS and interprets the user's voice request to find a destined appliance and a manner of control the same, and performs the requested control to the destined appliance. The result is notified to the user by means of a voice message".

There is apparently no reason to introduce Kawasaki to combine with Hefter and Sawada except using hindsight. But even the combination does not make the inventions of claims 3-26 obvious.

1. As per claim 3, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein the client device is a cellular telephone (See col. 4, lines 43-45); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity (See col. 9, lines 34-35); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity; wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, or any combination of these (See col. 5, lines 46-51); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network to which the serving entity is connected (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein the data network is the Intranet controlled by an Internet Service Provider; wherein the data network uses the TCP/IP protocol suite for transporting information (See col. 7, lines 46-63); wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital cellular network (See col. 5, lines 25-45); wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data network (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; serving entity employing attributes of said circuit switch network in authenticating said user, wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said client device, and wherein said attributed include a telephone number of said serving entity (See col. 9, lines 33-55); establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity (See col. 9, lines 11-26); the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to access and control said at least one remote service (See col. 9, lines 11-26) ; However, Hefter fails to teach wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; wherein the step of viewing the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privilege to said at least one remote service, activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository: and dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service Sawada teaches wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; wherein the step of viewing the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privilege to said at least one remote service (See col. 2, lines 16-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34). However Sawada fails to explicitly teach activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository; and

dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service.

Kawasaki et al teaches activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service (See col. 3, lines 36-40 and col. 5, lines 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki et al in the claimed invention of Hefter in view of Sawada in order to manage home appliances through the telephone network (See col. 5, lines 19-29).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 3 is a very narrow claim. It is allowable even when Hefter Sawada are combined with Kawasaki, It has a special combination of many elements useful for a particular embodiment of the present invention. Even if the office communication would be correct, which applicants take exception to, that the combined art makes each element in claim 3 obvious, a new, novel and advantageous combination is allowable. Thus claim 3 is allowable for itself and because it depends on claim 1.

2. As per claims 4-26 see claim 3 above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that all these claims are allowable each for itself and because each ultimately depends on allowable claim 1.

It is anticipated that this amendment brings allowance of claims 1-37. If any question remains, please contact the undersigned. Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____/Louis Herzberg/
Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane,
Monsey, NY 10952
Customer Number: 54856